	ATES DISTRICT		
1	KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) United States Attorney		
2 3	EUMI L. CHOI (CSBN 0722) Chief, Criminal Division		
4	SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013) Assistant United States Attorney Judge James Ware		
5	150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900		
6 7	San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5056 FAX: (408) 535-5066 Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov		
8			
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
13			
14		. 7	
15	v.) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSEE ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	}]	
16	JAMES LAUTERMILCH,		
17) SAN JOSE VENUE		
18	Defendant.)		
19			
20	The undersigned parties respectfully request that the above-referenced matter be continued		
21	from March 27, 2006 to April 17, 2006 at 1:30 p.m. The reason for the continuance is that the		
22	parties are continuing to negotiate a disposition and defense counsel needs additional time for		
23	investigation. Therefore, the parties also request an exclusion of time under the Speedy	Trial	
24	Act from March 27, 2006 until April 17, 2006. The parties agree and stipulate that an ex	clusion	
25	of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.		
26			
27			
28	DATED: SUSAN KNIGHT Assistant United States Attorney		
	Stipulation and [proposed] order CR 05-00626 JW 1		

Case 5:05-cr-00626-JW Document 13 Filed 04/12/06 Page 2 of 2

1	
2	DATED:/s/
3	NICK HUMY Assistant Federal Public Defender
4	Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that a status hearing be continued to April 17,
5	2006 at 1:30 p.m.
6	The Court FURTHER ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from
7	March 27, 2006 until April 17, 2006. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that
8	the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the
9	public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would
10	deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the
11	exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore
12	concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and
13 14	(B)(iv).
15	SO ORDERED.
16	DATED: April 12, 2006
17	JAMES WARE United States District Judge
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	